DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 115 522 SO 008 732

AUTHOR Barger, Hal M.
TITLE Demythologizing the Textbook President: Teaching About the President After Watergate.
PUB DATE Nov 75
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies (Atlanta, Georgia, November 26-29, 1975); Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *American Government (Course); Elementary Secondary Education; Political Attitudes; Political Issues; *Political Science; Political Socialization; Social Science Research; *Student Attitudes; *Teaching Techniques; *Textbook Evaluation; Values
IDENTIFIERS Presidency; *Watergate

ABSTRACT

In the wake of Watergate, this paper purports the need for a new approach to teaching about the American presidency. Traditionally, American government textbooks focus on institutional descriptions and constitutional arrangements of the presidency. This textbook approach to the presidency describes and values a chief executive who is generally benevolent, omnipotent, omniscient, and highly moral. The formal aspect is emphasized to the exclusion of any discussion about behavioral and policy aspects of the office. Recent research in student attitudes towards the presidency after Watergate indicates a significant loss of trust and affect in the president's honesty, trustworthiness, dedication to job, and responsiveness to people. What is needed now is for teachers and curricula developers to reconsider the president in four basic conceptual ways: (1) as an institution in the context of a more dynamic and conflict ridden political system than has been suggested thus far; (2) as a role of some historical and symbolic importance to our political culture; (3) as a unique personality occupying the role at any given time; and (4) as a political actor who has specific strengths and weaknesses in his role performance and who has successes and failures in his policy efforts. (Author/DE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED115522

SO008732

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

DEMYTHOLOGIZING THE TEXTBOOK PRESIDENT: TEACHING ABOUT THE PRESIDENT AFTER WATERGATE

Prof. Hal M. Barger
Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science
Trinity University
San Antonio, Texas

Presented at the 55th Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Atlanta, Georgia, November 25-29, 1975.

Pls. Return DEC 12 1975

DE-MYTHOLOGIZING THE TEXTBOOK PRESIDENT: TEACHING IN THE WAKE OF WATERGATE

Hal M. Barger
Trinity University
San Antonio, Texas 78284

Political scientists for a long time were unable to consider the American presidency without extolling the virtues of its rapidly expanding powers and broadening scope. Students of the office saw the strong presidency as an inevitable and desirable trend in the political system. In recent years, however, this intoxication with executive power turned into a hangover for many observers of the Oval office as they discovered there were dangers to the political system from certain excercises of unrestrained power and authority.

One particularly relevant criticism of presidential power that has ramifications for educators involves what has been called the "textbook presidency." The textbook presidency describes and values a chief executive who is generally benevolent, omnipotent, omniscient, and highly moral.[1] Not too long ago, such an image dominated textbooks from the elementary school through the university, although during the past five years, a far less positive and benevolent image appears to be projected in newer college texts.[2] There has also been an about-face by professional students of the presidency. Former advocates of a strong chief executive now believe the office has grown so powerful and isolated it no longer functions responsibly in a system of checks and balances. Furthermore, they see our traditional views of this high office as being unrealistic.[3]

Reevaluation of the office began before the Watergate scandal that brought humiliation and resignation to the administration of Richard M. Nixon. Criticism of presidential abuse of power and lack of credibility haunted the Johnson Administration during most of his elected term, and served as the catalyst for the revisionist textbook presidency at the college level, and the excessively omnipotent executive by professional students of the office. But Watergate unquestionably has dealt the White House its most devastating damage.

How and what will educators teach students about the president in the aftermath of the office's worst scandal? It remains to be seen to what extent elementary and high school social studies authors and publishers will restructure their homogeneously positive and uncritical image of the presidency. If the conflict of the past decade is any guide to the content, there probably will not be much critical analysis of the post-Watergate presidency. In fact, the nation's leading high school government textbook, in terms of sales and longevity, includes two brief references to Watergate in its 1974 edition, and neither directly involves any discussion of the role of president in the scandal, or its possible ramifications.[4]

Whether textbooks deal with the present state of the presidency or not, it would seem as if teachers will not be able to avoid it. One might logically expect students to greet with skepticism or outright indifference any attempt to present the contemporary presidency as the saintly prince of civics past.

The Textbook Presidency

A strong endorsement of the activist-purposeful-progressive and powerful powerful president has been found in college textbooks of the 1960's. General works published during this same period present similar values.[5] Consequently, it should not be surprising that pre-collegiate government texts likewise view the president in imperial tones.[6]

The bulk of the content in these books is focussed on institutional descriptions and constitutional arrangements. The formal is emphasized over the actual behavioral and policy aspects of the office. A set of generalizations can be derived from these books that either imply or directly assert:

1. The president is the embodiment of all that is good in America: honesty, integrity, courage and kindness.
2. He leads the free world in its fight against world communism.
3. He is the most knowledgeable and competent person in the nation to make decisions. His decisions are invariably made formally and in Constitutionally prescribed ways.
4. He leads legislatively because Congress fails to do so.
5. He wears many hats. ("A Day in the Life of the President.")
6. The president is infallible because he is the president.
7. He is a personality who symbolizes our past great presidents, and like his predecessors, he is the moral leader of the nation.
8. He is a thoughtful, benign leader who cares for all the people.
9. He deserves the support of all Americans because he is always acting in the interests of all Americans.

Two textbooks vary more from these generalizations than the others, discussing presidential policy-making with more of a substantive policy focus. They are Woll and Binstock's American Political System and Mehlinger and Patrick's American Political Behavior. By contrast, the book that most faithfully follows these generalizations is the nation's oldest and best-selling high school government text, Magruder's American Government.

The tone of Magruder's is set by a quote that begins the book's two chapters on the presidency:

> The presidency is more than executive responsibility. It is an inspiring symbol of all that is highest in America's purposes and ideals . . . No one could think of it except in terms of solemn consecration.7

The remaining assessments of the office in Magruder reflect this Homeric vision. For example, it is written of the president:

> He is a symbol of the people and the nation as a whole.
>
> He is the personal embodiment and representative of their dignity and majesty.
>
> (He) both reigns and rules.
>
> (He) insists that Congress enact most of the major legislation that it does.
>
> He is the leader of the free world in its struggle against the forces and designs of world communism.8

Nowhere in Magruder is there any substantive discussion about presidential performance in foreign or domestic policy areas, nor is there any discussion of personal qualifications of various incumbents. There is no indication that there is often conflict between the chief executive and other branches and political roles in our government.

Descriptions beyond the value statements tend toward dry recitations of the powers, duties and structural characteristics of the office, again submerging specific role holders in the institution. Actual incumbents are mentioned only twice, and past presidents appear by name only in accounts of assassinations, inaugurations, or in patriotic contexts.

Brown and Peltier's Government in Our Republic offers more discussion of former incumbents and their policies, but wholly in a positive and non-critical way. They do, however, observe that the office has become so powerful and complex that it is "literally impossible for any man to fill it well."[9] This does not prevent them from admiringly comparing the president to a "king in a monarchy."

> When he makes an appearance anywhere in the United States, all others present remain standing until he is seated or gives a sign to be seated. That goes for ladies too.[10]

Examples of the unquestioning loyalty owed by citizens to the office are common in all but the Woll-Binstock and Mehlinger-Patrick texts. There is an implication that the president is personally responsible for and capable of fulfilling most citizen demands and needs, particularly if he gets their loyal support.

Hartley and Vincent in American Civics argue "the man who holds this highest position in our nation's government bears a great burden and great responsibility. He must have the support and help of his fellow citizens."[11] Nowhere is there any suggestion citizens might have an equally vital obligation to occasionally disagree or question presidential decisions.

In fact, much of the discussion in pre-collegiate textbooks emphasize a passive, subject-oriented relationship between the citizen and his president, a kind of child-powerful father exchange. The authors of Our Living Government, for example, write:

> The president is more than a glorified national sheriff. He must protect our Constitutional form of government . . . against attack from within or without. He must make sure that individual citizens enjoy the personal rights guaranteed by the Constitution.[12]

The textbook presidency thus is to be readily trusted, with little consideration of who he is or what his ideologies might be. American Political Behavior, alone among the texts reviewed here, raises some important questions about how citizens come to know about presidential personality traits and how they act upon this knowledge. For example, a discussion on presidential honesty in the book suggests students list ten character traits desirable for a president to have.

> Since honesty is a trait that nearly all Americans expect of the president, you might begin your list with "honesty."
>
> Who would want a dishonest president?[13]

But all the other textbooks appear to present as a given rule that the president, because he is president, must be a man of extraordinary character and integrity. Little or no effort is made to encourage students to assess characteristics of different presidents, or aspects of character they might value in presidents past, present or future. Hartley and Vincent even find it significant to mention that the president "usually attends church on Sunday."[14]

As in the college texts of the 1950's and early 1960's, the growth in presidential power is seen by all of the pre-collegiate textbook authors as a generally beneficial and irreversible trend. Our Living Government presents a particularly biased argument, suggesting a number of measures to make the president even more independent of Congress and the bureaucracy. "It is not a question of power, for the president has that, but a matter of authority to carry out his powers," the authors believe.[15]

The omnipotent president upon whom the rest of the world depends is prominently featured in Hartley and Vincent:

> From the four corners of the world, the leaders of foreign governments come to Washington, D.C. to talk to the President of the United States.
>
> (M)any nations look to the U.S. for leadership and help in their struggle against communism. The president must furnish leadership not only to the American people, but also to the governments and people of every nation in the free world.[16]

The modern presidency is a role of much greater diversity and complexity, and it is much more dependent upon on the personality filling the office. Pre-collegiate textbooks fail to present the drama of this majestic and yet human institution. Men of vastly different styles, abilities, beliefs, and values give shape to its functioning. The role has been invested with history, respect, patriotism, and monarchical trappings. But for all this, it is still a peculiarly American institution, occupied by a popularly elected man who can never live up to the grandiose textbook description.

When such a role is found to be occupied by a man who is fallible and untrustworthy, much less an occasionally inadequate decision-maker, the structure crumbles. The textbook presidency is incapable of absorbing

and dealing with a Watergate any more than it was a much-criticized and unpopular presidential war in Southeast Asia. The perennial debate topic "Is the presidency too much for one man?" will probably continue to be implicitly answered in the negative in pre-collegiate textbooks, even though most presidential scholars and former advocates of the imperial presidency by now are answering "yes."

No one relishes destroying the greatness of a presidential office which over the long history of our nation has served us well. Nor would anyone suggest weakening a power that is needed to act quickly and decisively in times of international and domestic crises. But if the classroom and textbook presidency is going to even remotely resemble the presidency of the mid-1970's, we are going to have to deal with it more realistically and critically.

The critical question confronting educators and curriculum developers is to what extent is the incumbent separated from the office? In the textbook presidency, this distinction is blurred. The man is the role, and the role is the man.

What follows is a brief review of some findings of student images of the presidency immediately before the Watergate scandal broke, and one year later the Nixon Administration had reached its lowest point of public credibility and support. The ramifications of the data will then be applied to some suggestions about how we might approach the presidency in the aftermath of its worst hour.

Students and Watergate

The American president as a "benevolent leader" has dominated a considerable body of research and theory in political socialization. In their seminal study of the relationship between children and political authority, Easton and Dennis noted:

> From the earliest grade, the child sees the president as on a commanding height, far above adults and children. The President flies in on angel's wings, smiling, beneficent, powerful, almost beyond the realm of mere mortals.[17]

These early positive images become important in creating respect and esteem for the president in later adult life, enabling most Americans to have respect and to offer basic support for the president even if they disagree with him, belong to the opposition political party, or dislike the particular incumbent holding the office.

One theory that has enjoyed widespread acceptance suggests the early affection toward the president occurs because the president appears as a powerful father-like figure for the young child learning to relate to national authority. The child is so dependent upon family authority for satisfaction of his basic needs, that he comes to attribute positive and benign attributes to authority first in the family, then beyond.[18]

There can be no question that a considerable amount of political education in the elementary through secondary school years reinforces this benevolent model, although there is evidence that the high school age student is generally more critical of the role and the incumbent than he was at an earlier age. Consequently, the traditional textbook

presidency is redundant in one sense: his benevolent qualities reflect earlier basic socialization expectations. And in another aspect, the image appears increasingly incongruent for a young adult who has become more partisan, more issue-oriented, and more questioning of authority in general.

It is among the earlier age grades that the textbook image of the benevolent and all-powerful leader is more congruent with the child's images. At least up to the sixth grade, children were found to view the president as the dominant political authority in the nation. In fact, the typical child is able to express an opinion about the president even before he is exposed to formal classroom materials about the role and institution, or before there is much understanding or cognitive knowledge about the role.

This perception is so pervasively positive that Easton and Dennis were unable to find in all their testing a "child who did not express the highest esteem for the president." Children viewed the president "through rose-colored glasses, with no taint of criticism, mistrust, or indifference creeping into the picture."[19]

Recent research, however, has found a less than universal image of the benevolent leader. Considerable variations have been found among ethnic minority populations, and there is some evidence that both President Johnson and President Nixon were viewed much less enthusiastically by children from the early elementary school years into the high school grades.[20]

Several recent studies have found that Watergate affected children's orientations toward the presidency more than any other variable since testing for this relationship began. Furthermore, the data suggest that its impact was much the same at the elementary school level as even the normally more critical high school level.

In early 1974, one political scientist studied a sample of elementary school children in a prosperous Boston suburb and found students generally thought the president undependable and untrustworthy.[21] A study of children in grades three through eleven in Memphis, Tennessee also noted some deterioration in the normally positive images white, middle class children had of President Nixon.[22]

A study conducted by the author in April of 1973 and a year later of fifth through twelfth grade students in San Antonio, Texas, revealed a significant loss of trust and affect in the president's honesty, trustworthiness, dedication to job, and responsiveness to people.* Table I below shows the responses to six items related to traditional expectations of benevolence and ability of a president.

.....

Insert Table I about here

.....

---

* A pre-Watergate sample of 792 fifth and sixth grade students was surveyed in April, 1973. A sample of 512 fifth and sixth grade students were sampled in approximately the same schools one year later, but from different populations. In addition, some 484 senior high school students were sampled in the 1974 survey. Students were asked to respond "agree, disagree or no opinion" to statements about the president. The statements are displayed here as the titles to the subtables. President Richard M. Nixon was not mentioned by name in any items.

Table I: Responses to Statements about the President, by School Grade Level and Sample.

	Elementary Sample		Senior High Sample
	1973	1974	1974
A. "The President is honest."			
Agree	44%	14%	9%
No opinion	25	31	24
Disagree	31	55	67
B. "The President is a nice person."			
Agree	54	28	17
No opinion	24	37	58
Disagree	22	35	25
C. Rating the President by how much he is liked.			
Much	56	27	18
Some	20	21	22
Little or not at all	24	52	60
D. "The President works hard."			
Agree	62	33	34
No opinion	17	28	31
Disagree	21	39	34

Table I: continued.

	Elementary Sample		Senior High Sample
	1973	1974	1974
E. "The President knows a lot."			
Agree	56%	32%	43%
No opinion	21	35	29
Disagree	23	33	28
F. Rating the President on "how much he helps my family."			
Much	51	29	20
Some	26	27	22
Little or not at all	23	44	58

The data in Table I reveal a much diminished presidency as a result of Watergate. A significant decline on all six measures relating to trust, personableness, benevolence, knowledge and performance is indicated for both elementary and secondary students, suggesting that younger students are far more capable of distinguishing the man from the office than textbooks or theory previously have implied. Table I shows elementary students have become just as critical--perhaps even cynical--as their older peers. The loss of affection between 1973 and 1974 is surprisingly sharp for the fifth and sixth grade samples.

The Watergate data are similar although more negative than most earlier research into ethnic minority group children and adolescents' attitudes toward the presidency. Ethnic minority studies have generally led to the suspicion that images of the president and other political authority figures may be generationally determined and issue-specific.[23] Abramson, for example contrasts what he calls the social-deprivation theory that posits attitudes are the function of societally-shaped personalities, and a political-reality theory which suggests they are generally shaped by actual political conditions.[24] Political attitudes not only change, but they change differentially for different groups under varying conditions.

This leads to speculation that issues, crises, and personalities are more important in determining legitimacy and receptivity to authority than early benevolent leader research implies. Assessments of the feelings of minority groups show relatively rational policy and personality assessments that retard or encourage development of feelings of benevolence and trust in particular leaders. The benevolent leader theory appears consequently

to be related to stable, less controversial epochs. Easton and Dennis acknowledge the possibility that the United States might be entering a period of political instability that might restructure basic attitudes toward political authority. But are perceptions of the president as benevolent, infallible, protective and omnipotent part and parcel of the child's developmental process, or are they dependent upon a state of "politics as usual?"[25]

It has been argued that the child relates himself not to the occupant of the White House as a man, but to the role itself:

> This is of vital importance for the input of diffuse support for a political system. It may be a singular mainstay of the presidential structure . . .[26]

If the child fixed his attention on the president as a man and revered the specific qualities of the incumbent, he would learn that the legitimacy of authority is dependent upon individual qualities. This, however, would cause the child to have to virtually reorient himself to each successive president based upon a consideration of whether or not the man had the qualities admired in his predecessors.

> To command acceptance, each president would have to stimulate a belief in his personal adequacy. Leadership succession would be a source of constant political strain. The routinization of charisma would have difficulty in developing.[27]

Obviously, the alternative to this perspective is to make the president a symbol rather than a role performer. Younger children accept him because he is the president, and they possess a set of idealized expectations about him regardless of who he may be. By personalizing the office, one is able to accept any and all incumbents, and the system is maintained in a relatively stable manner.

Respect for our most important political office theoretically would be transmitted easily across generations, with partisan concerns or structures providing relatively insignificant influence in altering basic perceptions of the presidency. Adults would be able to criticize and condemn an incumbent and yet retain respect for the office. However, there remains a danger that excessively harsh criticism, or a serious loss of confidence in a particular president could undermine the authority of the presidency as an institution.

Weissberg has argued that depersonalization of the presidency is the most important feature of the maturing student's orientation to national political authority. Nonetheless, even as he begins to understand the president is not a divine monarch, the older child begins to perceive the incumbent as part of an aura that is the American presidency. What is important, however, is the child of about twelve years or older is increasingly capable of separating the man from the office, a process that would enable one to hold a low evaluation of an incumbent without necessarily condemning the office. Dissatisfaction can be channelled into replacing the man, not the institution.

Introducing the "New" President

What is needed now is for teachers and curricula developers to reconsider the president in four basic conceptual ways:

1. as an instituion in the context of a more dynamic and conflict-ridden political system than heretofor has been suggested.
2. as a role of some historical and symbolic importance to our political culture.

3. as a unique personality occupying the role at any given time.
4. as a political actor who has specific strengths and weaknesses in his role performance, and who has successes and failures in his policy efforts.

To a considerable extent, the problem is a theoretical one of distinguishing what Easton has described as the three levels of support found in any political system: the community, the regime, and the governing authorities.[28] The political community refers to those aspects of a political system that identify a collection of people as members in a shared effort. Community involves feelings of patriotism, traditionalism, and even familism. It is those unique aspects of our system that bind most of us together as "Americans." The almost royal regard with which Americans traditionally held their presidents is a characteristic of the political community. Indeed, the death of presidents while in office has occasioned grief for many citizens similar to the loss of a family member or parent.[29]

The regime describes the actual constitutional processes and structures of the political system, in this sense, the presidency and the institutional system of checks and balances. Our examination of pre-collegiate textbooks indicated the regime receives a disproportionate amount of attention. Considerable space is devoted to duties, powers, privileges and activities of presidents.

The third level, the governmental authorities, includes those specific individuals who hold office and perform the regime roles at any given time. Here, for example, we would be referring to President Richard M. Nixon or President Gerald R. Ford.

Traditionally, textbooks and curricula indiscriminantly tied together these three levels of governmental support in the belief such an approach would inculcate system-supporting political values. As a result, the charismatic aspects of the presidential role are overemphasized in tandem with institutional characteristics and patriotic symbolism. Particularly is this the case for the important early school years, when children receive their first classroom introduction to the presidency with strong doses of legend, myth and personality. Rarely are children taught to consider the important distinctions between a complex institution, an incumbent, policy issues, and the American conception of limited and responsible political authority.

So strongly are the three supportive levels entertwined formally and informally for elementary school age children, Easton has argued it may be logically impossible for the child to see the president in a position of power and responsibility and yet not think well of him.

> If children see a person in an elevated status, they very probably also will believe he is a wonderful person, especially if the status is approved by adults and remains so distant that little capacity exists for the child to test his evaluations through direct experience.30

The American Political Science Association's Committee on Pre-Collegiate has criticized this tendency to overemphasize charismatic qualities of political authority at the same time a disproportionate attention is given historical events, legal structures and formal aspects of decision-making. Such an undifferentiated approach encourages a subject-oriented relationship to authority rather than a participatory one.[31]

Obviously there are countervailing attitudes about the value of our traditional approach to learning about the president. At least 45 states have laws requiring and regulating the teaching of government in schools. Implicitly and sometimes explicitly defined in most state requirements is the intention to produce not just an understanding of American political institutions, but a sense of respect and devotion as well.

The problem with this goal is can respect, devotion and substantive information and theories about government be taught when inconsistencies are impossible to avoid? In the case of the presidency, the textbook image of a benevolent and omniscient leader may be pedagogically possible--and intellectually reasonable--when the leader is in fact widely perceived as benevolent and possessing of leadership abilities. This may, however, be more likely during periods when specific issues and role behaviors are not as important as the personality of the man in office. It may be no accident of history that many presidents who were most popular while in office were men who later were regarded by students of the office as weak presidents. And some of the so-called "great" presidents were men who sparked considerable public debate, criticism and reaction while serving their terms in office.

If this is the case, then textbooks that are adulatory of presidential leadership are redundant during times of benevolent leadership, but contradictory during times of presidential stress and challenge, or at best misleading or irrelevant.

According to a political-reality theory, which the data from Watergate studies tend to support, students will be exposed to contradictory and critical messages during times of conflict and stress, and these messages quite likely will overcome or at least influence traditional socialization learning patterns. Events such as Watergate occur regardless of the fact they are inconsistent with tightly constructed and tested theories or positivistic educational goals.

If our curricula and textbooks fail to differentiate the presidency in terms of regime, incumbent and our political community, we may be doing infinitely more hard than good to the system. Students should be made aware that an individual can admire or not admire the presidency as a role and an institution, respect and hold patriotic feelings for certain occupants of the office in the past, and yet not like a particular president. Too often, nonsupport of a president has been interpreted by many sectors of our society as "un-American" or "unpatriotic" or "soft on communism." The British have no comparable dilemma when their political leadership loses support from various sectors of the population. An Englishman may support the Queen yet hold a highly critical view of the Prime Minister and the party in Parliament. There is no equivalent accusation in England that suggests one is "un-English!"

Both recent imcumbents who found their bases of support eroding attempted to forestall popular sentiments against them by using the textbook presidency as a rallying flag. Nixon asserted on numerous occasions during Watergate that those who sought to unravel Watergate were attacking him, and by attacking him as president, they were attacking the office and by implication, weakening

the nation. The late President Johnson likewise tried to accuse critics of his Viet-Nam policy of trying to damage the presidency and the nation. The textbook presidency encouraged this kind of analogy, despite the fact that it refutes our democratic creed that we are a nation of laws and not of men.

Much like the Hollywood myth of love and marriage, Americans traditionally viewed the president with such unrealistic expectations and through such rose-colored glasses that the real man became a fairy prince instead of a man with one of the world's most powerful and impossible jobs. We have found too many times that the relationship between a president and the electorate was not made in heaven. But like the ever hopeful suitor, we continued to chase after the idealized and romanticized version which our textbooks, teachers and culture provided.

In the aftermath of Watergate, a more critical and substantive approach to the presidency would not only benefit our young by preparing them for a more realistic political vision, it could contribute to a more balanced presidency.

Former Johnson press secretary George Reedy has observed:

> The atmosphere of the White House is calculated to instill in any man a sense of destiny. He literally walks in the footsteps of hallowed figures--of Jefferson, of Jackson, of Lincoln. . . (T)he White House is a heady atmosphere. The almost sanctified relics of a distant, semimythical past surround (the president.) From the moment he enters the halls he is made aware that he has become enshrined in a pantheon of semidivine mortals who have shaken the world, and that he has taken from their hands the heritage of American dreams and aspirations.
>
> Unfortunately for him, divinity is a better basis of inspiration than it is for government.[32]

NOTES

[1]Thomas E. Cronin, "The Textbook Presidency and Political Science," in Joseph R. Fiszman and Gene S. Poschman (eds.), The American Political Arena, (3rd ed.; Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1972), 294-309.

[2]Ibid., 300.

[3]See for example: Emmet John Hughes, The Living Presidency (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1974); George E. Reedy, The Twilight of the Presidency (New York: New American Library, 1970); and Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., The Imperial Presidency (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1973).

[4]William A. McClenaghan, Magruder's American Government (57th edition; Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1974).

[5]Cronin, 295-298.

[6]Textbooks reviewed for this article include: Stuart G. Brown and Charles L. Peltier, Government in Our Republic (revised edition; New York: Macmillan, 1964); John H. Haefner and Harold R. Bruce and Robert K. Carr, Our Living Government (Glenview: Scott, Foresman, 1970); William H. Hartley and William S. Vincent, American Civics (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1971); McClenaghan, Magruder's American Government (55th edition; Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972); Howard D. Mehlinger and John J. Patrick, American Political Behavior (Lexington: Ginn and Company, 1972); and Peter Woll and Robert H. Binstock, America's Political System (New York, Random House, 1972.)

[7]McClenaghan, 283.

[8]Ibid.

[9]Brown and Peltier, 167.

[10]Ibid., 157.

[11]Hartley and Vincent, 88.

[12]Heafner, Bruce and Carr, 226.

[13]Mehlinger and Patrick, 264.

[14]Hartley and Vincent, 85.

[15]Hefner, Bruce and Carr, 240.

[16]Hartley and Vincent, 86.

[17]David Easton and Jack Dennis, Children in the Political System: The Origins of Political Legitimacy (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968), 171.

[18]Dean Jaros, "Children's Orientations toward the President: Some Additional Theoretical Considerations and Data," Journal of Politics, 30 (May, 1967), 373-75.

[19]Easton and Dennis, 177.

[20]Robert Weissberg, Political Learning, Political Choice, and Democratic Citizenship (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974), 51-3.

[21]F. Christopher Arterton, "The Impact of Watergate on Children's Attitudes toward Political Authority," Political Science Quarterly, 89 (Spring, 1974), 269-288.

[22]Michael Lupfer and Charles Kenny, "The Impact of Watergate on Black and White Youths' Views of the Presidency," (Austin: Workshop on Political Socialization, March, 1974, mimeographed.)

[23]See: Paul R. Abramson, "Political Efficacy and Political Trust among Black School Children: Two Explanations," Journal of Politics, 34 (1972), 1243-69.

[24]Ibid.

[25]Arterton, 286-8.

[26]Easton and Dennis, 201.

[27]Ibid., 202.

[28]David Easton, A Systems Analysis of Political Life (New York: John Wiley & sons, 1965), Chapters 11-13.

[29]Robert S. Sigel, "An Exploration into Some Aspects of Political Socialization: School Children's Reactions to the Death of a President,"in M. Wolfenstein and G. Kleman (eds.) Children and the Death of a President (New York: Doubleday, 1965), 30-61.

[30]Easton and Dennis, 177.

[31]American Political Science Association, Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education, "Political Education in the Schools: The Challenge for Political Science," PS, Newsletter of the American Political Science Association, IV (Summer, 1971).

[32]Reedy, 27.